mostly affected. What is the opinion of the innocent villagers in the border areas ? The common man in border does not worry whether this village will go to Maharashtra or to Mysore. He is not interested in all these things. They are worried only with their day-to-day problems. The common man wants peace. He wants a dignified life a secured job, food at his affordable price an humble home to shelter, education to his children, and above all equal human rights. He feels he must be allowed to improve his own language and cultural heritage uninterupted as he is not interrupting or interested in interrupting others in their progress. they are least worried about this border dispute whether they speak Kannada or Marathi. Then, who is responsible for all these ? The interested parties are different.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Mr. Patil, can continue his speech on Monday. Now, we shall take up half-an-hour discussion.

SRI S. NIJALINGAPPA. -The discussion may continue on Monday also.

SRI H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—If the Hon'ble member wishes to close within 10 minutes I will have no objections and I will also close by 1 O' clock.

HALF-AN-HOUR DISCUSSION ON THE POINTS RAISED OUT OF T E ANSWERS TO QUESTION No. 46 *re*: PRIVATE TRANSPORT OWNING BUS PRMITS.

SRI H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Sir, I raise a discussion on the points arising out of the answers given on 11th December 1967 to Question No. 46 (168) regarding 'Private Transport owning Bus Permits.'

12-30 P.M.

The question referred to was with regard to the private Transport Owners in the State and also with regard to owners having a daily mileage route of more than 500 miles and the routes in which they hold permits. A reply is given to the fact that there are 1180 Private Transport Owners in the State. In our State we haveaccepted nationalisation as the policy of the State and in parsuance thereto, time and again, Government have issued statements to the fact that certain routes will be nationalised. I understand now, as I read in papers today, that Kanakapura pocket had been allowed to be nationalised and the Supreme Court has given its verdict. I also understand that the next route they want to nationalise is the one in Kolar. But, what does not appeal to me is the way in which discrimination has taken place in the matter of nationalisation of these routes. I would like to refer to the one between Chitradurga and Harihar. From Bangalore upto Belgaum throughout the route is natonalised. But, the small pocket. between Chitradurga

(Sri H. Siddaveerappa)

and Harihar covering a distance of 48 miles, the route which was there for being nationalised, for which a time limit of only 3 months was given up to this day has not been taken over by the Government and as many private owners as possible have been allowed to operate in that route although Government buses are plying. What is the policy you have in this ? Is it because some of your own men are operating these routes that you do not want to take over or is it because there are some in whom you are interested whose permits you do not want to take, you have allowed that ? While I was in charge of that portfolio, I know for certain—If you want, you may refer to the old records—that route has been nationalised by the end of June 1956. Then, they came and made a request to the Government that they may be given three months time, upto end of 1st November 1956 so that they are prepared to give away those routes. Out of deference to the wishes of those people, Government gave only three months time. Now, what do we see even though 10 years are over ? Has it not come to the notice of the Government that a small pocket is there ? Now that you are diverting your attention to Kanakapura, Kolar and various other places, what is the policy involved ? I feel that this Government has no policy based on objectivity ; everything is subjective—'A' is affected—he is my man and therefore don't go there, 'B' is affected, he is not my man and therefore go there and take away the route. This kind of policy discrimination does not redound to the credit of the Government. Formerly there was a policy in Mysore Government that they would take only the National highways and important revenue yielding routes and leave the rest to the private operators. You have not been following anythig like that, and if you see the number of private owners, who have now come into being—I can read the names of a few of them—have a monopoly of their own.

Item No. 14.—Agumbe-Harihar. There is one private owner who has got 24 routes. This is a socialistic State. There are a number of unemployed persons. If you give one route to an individual, perhaps he can earn his living.

Davangere Shimoga Route.—There is one operator who has got 29 routes, and he has been operating. Likewise, I can give yon any number of instances. Take for instance, item No. 28 in your list. In this item you will find that there are as many as 48 routes given to a single individual, some of them will run into hundreds of miles and some do 2,000 to 3,000 miles daily mileage

Item No. 29.—This gentleman is running 37 routes.

I have given only the names of persons who have maximum number of routes. Likewise, there are as many as 44 gentlemen or companies, who have got more than 500 miles, and then you have got inter-state routes. Take for instance, route which starts from Chitradurga to

Tirupathi, and Anantapur to Kurnool. Like that, new routes have come up and my own feeling is that this Government seems to have thought, on any given occasion, wherever possible, to create as many opportunities as possible for their own henchmen, to make money at the cost of the State.

I can show you in places where Government buses are running, you have indiscriminately allowed private people to operate and timings are so arranged that Government buses do not get any profit and private individuals of your choice take away the profit. This is not the way that Government should run the services when you have invested so much money. You have invested 17 crores in the Road Transport Department and we have thousands of people working there. You want them to show profit. You do not know your mind. You have not got a firm policy. You are yielding wherever there is pressure. All these things have brought about this utter ruination. I may tell you, If I were in your position, by this time, I would have given you a return of Rs ten crores per annum. You can earn that much if it is properly maintained. You are not getting even 2–3 per cent on your investment. Most of it is borrowed capital and the services that you have given are something which we cannot speak about.

I have raised this question just to say all these private operators are so many ulsters and you have been permitting them because they are all your henchmen and friends. I therefore feel—you means Government—I am not saying the Minister for Transport, I mean Government collectively. I feel Sir, there is a lot of discrimination being shown in the matter of allowing the private operators in this field. I feel the time has now come for the Government to think over it, to ponder over it and then take an objective view of things and lay down a policy which should be governed only on certain well-laid principles.

Sri MOHAMAD ALI (Minister for Transport and Tourism).—Sir, It has become very usual to make criticism either way. If we nationalise, some people say that we have nationalised to the disadvantage of certain sections of people. If we do not nationalise, it is always said that we want to safeguard certain vested interests. All such allegations have gone even up to the Supreme Court and I would like to inform the House that in almost all cases, the Supreme Court has held that the Government decision is very fair. Any how, I am sorry that the Hon'ble Member Sri Siddaveerappa has said that the policy of nationalisation of the routes in the State is not fair. Sir, today as things stand, about 67 per cent areas, 59 per cent of the routes have been nationalised and in order to completely nationalise all routes in the State, we require a further amount of 16 crores. The provision that is made in the Fourth Five Year Plan is about 4.5 crores. I do not know what is going to happen as a result of further pruning. Any how, in the first year of the Fourth Five Year Plan, a meagre amount of 19 lakhs is provided and this year an amount of 20 lakhs have been provided to the Road Transport Corporation. And the Road Transport Corporation has

(SRI MOHAMED ALI)

to implement the Shimoga and Mangalore schemes, the Corporation may require easily an amount of two crores and the Corporation is going to implement the shemes from their own internal resources. Therefore, it is very difficult for the Road Transport Corporation to take up further schemes for nationalisation. Government is also equally anxious to nationalise the routes as early as possible, but the greatest difficulty is that it requires heavy investment and it will not be possible to find funds as we desire. And Naturally the Government has to take up a phased programme of nationalisations of routes in the State.

Sir, on the eve of Reogniastion of the States the entire erstwhile Bombay Karnatak area, erstwhile Hyderabad-Karnatak area was nationlised and in the old Mysore State, only the B. T. S. was nationalised and the routes that were leading up to district headquarters and connecting the capital, that is Bangalore were nationalised. So, the position on 1st November 1956, so far as Bangalore Chitradurga route is concerned, it was only nationalised up to Chitradurga and today I understand why the routes beyond Chitradurga have not been nationlised by the Government. I can understand and I do appreciate the difficulty of the then Government for not nationalising the other routs in the old Mysore area. I do not think that the Government has not taken up the question of nationalisation beyond Chitradurga because of any pressure or the then Government wanted to safeguard the interests of private operators. But anyhow the policy was there and a modest beginning was made at that time and B. T. S. has been taken over by the Government, to provide transport facilities to the people in the City, although the city services have been always most uneconomic. I do not think during any time or anybody's regime, the road transport services were able to give a margin of profit more than 3 or 4 per cent.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—I am sorry. I can give you figures. I have shown on the floor of the House that in one year we gave 34 per cent. But B. T. S. is always a loss. You can never expect to make profit there.

Sri MOHAMED ALI.—So far B. T. S. is incurring heavy loss. No City Service in India or anywhere in the world is making profit. But we are bound to run it as a social amenity. I do not think that the nationalisation that has taken place so far as B. T. S. is concerned is wrong. I cannot say that. Whether we incur loss or make profit, we are trying to reduce losses. The losses have been reduced during these two years from 35 lakhs each year to 20 lakhs. What I am saying is the profit that is made by the Road Transport Corporation is nearing 5 per cent excluding interest and depriciation. It must be remembered that the Road Transport Corporation is paying more than two crores by way of tax to the Government.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—Others are also paying.

Sri MOHAMED ALI.—There is so much of heavy taxation that this road-transport industry is becoming most uneconomic. Dr. Keskar's Enquiry Report clearly indicates that it has reached saturation point and it is impossible to put further tax on any motor vehicle. Every year whenever there is a taxation proposal, along with it there is rise in the cost of petrol, diesel oil and all those things. It is not correct to expect abnormal income from the Road Transport Corporation.

Any how, as I have stated just now, based on the policy that existed before the reorganisation of the State, only the road up to Chitradurga has been nationalised. And after the reorganisation of the State, in pursuance of the policy of nationalisation, Government has taken up routes in compact and contiguous areas. In accordance with this policy, routes in compact and contiguous areas in Bangalore District, Mysore District and Hassan District and subsequently routes in the area contiguous to Raichur and Dharwar Districts and routes in Bellary District were also nationalised. Recently, Shimoga and Mangalore schemes have been approved taking up routs in contiguous area in west of Mysore District, west of Hassan District, and also north and east of Hassan District. In addition, the road sections from Mangalore to Shimoga and Shimoga to Davanagere *via* Harihar have also been nationalised. The approved nationalisation scheme requires about 150 vehicles for operation.

The remaining parts of Chitradurga District will be taken up in the second phase for nationalisation. And that entire sector, eastern and western section of Chitradurga District, will be requiring about 300 vehicles. And, therefore, the only difficulty before the Government is paucity of funds.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—I want explanation for only this 48 miles.

Sri MOHAMED ALI.—The whole trouble is that. We have to take compact areas and all link roads which lead to this main road. Otherwise, what is going to happen is dislocation. If we do not link all other roads, we have to allow the private operators some kind of overlapping to reach other destinations.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—You are losing because although your buses run from Belgaum to Bangalore, that distance of 48 miles from Chitraduga and Harihar is not nationalised; it is in this area you are losing.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—Between Harihar and Hubli, the route is nationalised. From Harihar to Chitradurga, it is contiguous. Then according to your policy, it should have been nationalised. Why is it not nationalised ?

Sri MOHAMED ALI.—One road is contiguous, I agree. But the other roads linking both the main road and the highway are not. Unless

(SRI MOHAMED ALI)

we nationalise, we have to allow private operators certain amount of overlapping. Therefore, nationalisation of these routes will not serve any purpose unless the entire area is nationalised.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—I will give a scheme to the hon. Minister. As a matter of fact, we had proposed to take it up from 1st November 1956.

Sri MOHAMED ALI.—We can separately discuss. There are certain decisions of the Supreme Court and the High Court. Wherever we nationalise, we cannot allow any private operators on these roads and, therefore, when there are so many link roads, all communications by road transport will be cut off, if this road is nationalised.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—We can do it.

Sri MOHAMED ALI.—I do not think we will be able to do it.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Unfortunately, you are not viewing objectively. You are viewing only subjectively.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—You are having something in your mind. You want to allow somebody to operate on those roads. You are not prepared to exclude them. That is why you do not want to nationalise.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Give me a formula. I will work out and see that it is possible.

Sri MOHAMED ALI.—You may say anything. But I have to very strongly repudiate what you say. It is very bad to attribute motives.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—It is apparent.

Sri MOHAMED ALI.—We can also say that. Why it has not been nationalised, then ?

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—May I request you to see the old records and come to conclusion ? Please ask for it in the office.

Sri MOHAMED ALI.—What record was available has been looked into.

Sri K. H. PATIL.—Why not constitute a Committee of experienced persons like Sri Siddaveerappa and others and get practical suggestions for nationalisation in the interests of the State ?

Sri MOHAMED ALI.—I do appreciate whatever suggestions are made by the hon. Members of this House and they will certainly be kept in view.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—At least, have the courtesy to say, "I will examine the records and see what has happened there." Why have you allowed them to continue these ten years ?

Sri MOHAMED ALI.—I do not know why you allowed them at initial stage.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Becase they came and requested and I gave them three months' time.

Sri MOHAMED ALI.—That record is not before me. I will look into it. So far as favouritism to any private operator is concerned, my submis-ion is that transport of both passenger and goods carriages is the life line of our economic activity and if they are stopped, economic life will come to a deadlock. And, therefore, in the absence of nationalisation, we cannot allow vacuum to continue.

Sri N. HUTCHAMASTI GOWDA (Huliyurdurga).—Those general principles are all right.

Sri MOHAMED ALI.—May be. Therefore, permits are being granted by the R.T.A., a quasi-judicial authority. Government has nothing to do with the sanction of permits. They can keep in view the requirements of the travelling public and also the capacity of the person. What is needed under the rule, is to give preference to viable units because if a person has got only one bus and if he is unable to get another bus in case of failure, what type of difficulty the travelling public has to face? Can be any body's guess.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—If that is the principle, there were viable units in Hassan. Why did you nationalise ?

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—So also in Bellary.

1-00 P.M.

Sri MOHAMED ALI.—I have said that those were contiguous and compact areas, and have been nationalised Hassan and Bellary have been taken up, first because of Contiguity.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—Nationalisation is only one policy. You cannot change the policy from District to District.

Sri MOHAMED ALI.—Hasaan and Bellary were contiguous to Dharwar and Raichur and therefore they were nationalised.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—Is not Chitradurga contiguous ?

Sri MOHAMED ALI.—Yes. That will be our second phase for nationalisation. We were not able to take it up because funds were not available. Any way, so far as grants of permits are concerned, when application is made for permits, that is considered by a quasi-judicial body and in the case of an aggrieved person, an appeal lies to the Transport Appellate Tribunal where a District Judge decides the case.

(SRI MOHAMED ALI)

Therefore, Government has nothing to do so far as issue of permits is concerned. I emphatically refute the motives and allegations made in the grant of permits.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Now the House will adjourn and meet tomorrow at 1 P.M.

The House adjourned at Four Minutes past One of the Clock to meet again at One of the Clock on Monday, the 18th December 1967.

WD 9723—GPB—600—2-2-1968